

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 29, 2009. Claims 1-10, 12-20, 23-47, 49-65, and 143-198 are pending in the application. Claims 66-142 are cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to refile claims directed to the subject matter of the cancelled claims in a future divisional application. Claims 1, 28, 143, and 173 are amended as reflected in the above listing of claims. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10, 12-20, 23-47, and 49-198 stand rejected.

Entry of the foregoing amendment and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-10, 12-20, 23-47, 49-65, 143-146, 148-176 and 178-198 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleges that “it is not clear from the specification that ‘low’ and ‘high’ are synonymous with ‘lower’ and ‘higher’.” (Office Action at page 2.) Applicants respectfully disagree. It is clear from the specification that the present invention comprises two polymers, one of which has a comparatively low level of crystallinity and one of which has a higher level of crystallinity. (See paragraph [0083], “the high crystallinity polymer has a higher crystallinity than the low crystallinity polymer.”) The specification also states that the terms “low” and “high” are used in a relative sense, and are not absolute. (Paragraph [0022].) It is therefore plain from the use of the word “relative” that “low” and “high” are synonymous with “lower” and “higher,” because the words are used to describe the crystallinity of the two polymers relative to one another, and one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the interchangeability of the terms. Further, it is well established that the written description requirement is met even when the language used in the claims is not in *ipsis verbis* in the specification. (See MPEP §2163(II)(A)(3)(a), “If a skilled artisan would have understood the inventor to be in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing, even if every nuance of the claims is not explicitly

described in the specification, then the adequate description requirement is met.”) For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that the written description requirement is met by the pending claims, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

The claims have additionally been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because there is allegedly “no support in the original disclosure for the limitation ‘about’ 60 or less.” Applicants have amended the independent claims to remove the word “about,” thus obviating the rejection.

Claims 1-10, 12-20, 23-47, 49-65, 143-146, 148-176 and 178-198 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action alleges that “it is unclear what is meant by ‘low’ and ‘high’ crystallinity.” (Office Action at page 3.) Applicants respectfully disagree, and contend that the application clearly sets forth not only methods for measuring crystallinity and related properties such as melting point and heat of fusion, but also the differences in those properties which distinguish the lower crystallinity polymer from the higher crystallinity polymer. (See, for example, paragraphs [0039], [0043]-[0045], [0072], and [0081]-[0083].) Applicants have, however, amended the claims to further specify the crystallinity of the claimed polymers in an effort to remove outstanding issues and expedite prosecution of the application.

As reflected in the listing of claims, above, the independent claims have been amended to specify that the lower crystallinity polymer has a polypropylene crystallinity of from 3% to 40%, as determined by DSC. Support for this amendment is found in the specification in at least paragraphs [0043] and [0044]. The claims have further been amended to specify that that higher crystallinity polymer has a polypropylene crystallinity higher than that of the lower crystallinity polymer. Support for this amendment is found in the specification in at least paragraph [0083].

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-10 12-20, 23-47, 49-65, 143-146, 148-176 and 178-198 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tsurutani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,792; hereafter "Tsurutani").

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by Tsurutani. At the very least, Tsurutani does not teach, disclose, or suggest a first layer comprising a lower crystallinity polymer having 72-90 wt% propylene, 10-20 wt% ethylene, a melting point from 20-110 °C, a Mooney viscosity of 60 or less, and a polypropylene crystallinity of from 3-40%; and a second layer comprising a higher crystallinity polymer comprising polypropylene and having a melting point at least 25 °C higher than that of the lower crystallinity polymer and a polypropylene crystallinity which is higher than that of the lower crystallinity polymer, as required in every claim.

The Office Action asserts that the amorphous propylene copolymer disclosed by Tsurutani is equivalent to the lower crystallinity polymer claimed herein. This assumption is in error, as the term “amorphous” is understood by those of skill in the art to mean a polymer which lacks crystallinity (usually indicated by no measurable melting point). In contrast, the lower crystallinity polymers of the present invention have a polypropylene crystallinity of between 3 and 40%, and have measurable melting points of between 20 and 110 °C. Clearly the amorphous polymers of Tsurutani are not equivalent to the lower crystallinity polymers of the present invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Tsurutani. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

CONCLUSION

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated, since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2003B002/2).

Respectfully submitted,

July 29, 2009

Date

/Stephen Timmins/

Stephen Timmins
Attorney for Applicants
U.S. Registration No. 48,481

ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
(281) 834-2866 Office
(281) 834-2495 Facsimile